

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Disclosure Objections

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because "S 46" as specified at page 12, line 20 of the Specification is not shown in any of the Figures of the drawings. Applicants have amended the Specification per the Examiner's suggestion. No new matter has been added.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner objected to block element 66 and 57 of Figure 2 because they are not located within the Specification. The Examiner also objected to block element 6910 of Figure 6 because it should be changed to "690" in order to agree with page 17, line 13 of the Specification. Applicants have amended Figure 2 and changed block element 66 to block element 42. Applicants have also amended the Specification to include block element 57 clipping [or] Applicants have amended Figure 2 and changed block element 57 to 688 of Figure 2 [please confirm which you prefer]. Additionally, Applicants have amended Figure 6, element block 6910, and changed it to 690 per the Examiner's suggestion. For the Examiner's convenience, a complete set of Drawings, including Replacement Sheets for Figures 2 and 6 are being submitted herewith in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.85. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Rejections

Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 19 has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-10 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,436,665 (hereinafter "Uneo").

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. (Manual of Patent Examining Procedures (MPEP) ¶ 2131.)

The independent claims of the present application include limitations not taught by Uneo. As a result, Uneo does not anticipate the independent claims of the present application.

In particular, applicant's independent claims include the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of:

generating a second body of data being sufficient to enhance the quality of the viewable video sequence generated from the first body of data, the second body of data being generated by subtracting a reconstructed body of data from a subsection of the source video sequence. . ." (emphasis added) (Applicant's Independent Claim 1).

Uneo, however, teaches away from the claimed limitations shown above, by disclosing switch predictions for even and odd fields of video using a low-resolution local decoded signal and a high-resolution local decoded signal on a field by field basis. (Uneo, col. 1, lines 42-49). In particular, Uneo discloses, a terminal 10 where an input picture signal input is connected to a dividing circuit 101 via a field merge circuit 100. The field merge circuit 100 performs field merging of a field picture to treat the field picture of an input picture signal as a frame picture, and the dividing circuit 101 is provided to divide the frame picture into a plurality of blocks. The output of the dividing circuit 101 is connected to one input terminal 10 of a subtracter 12 and a predictor and prediction-mode decision unit 104. (Uneo, col. 1, lines 57-66).

As a result, the Uneo reference clearly does not disclose, and actually teaches away from, applicant's claimed limitation of "the second body of data being generated by subtracting a reconstructed body of data from a subsection of the source video sequence. . ." Therefore, Uneo does not anticipate applicant's independent claims.

Applicant's remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims as discussed above, and therefore include the distinguishing claim limitations as discussed above. As a further result, applicant's remaining claims are not anticipated by Miller.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call John Ward at (408) 720-8300, x237.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 7/1/03

  
John P. Ward  
Reg. No. 40,216

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300

Appl. No. 09/758,647  
Amdt. dated \_\_\_\_\_  
Reply to Office action of May 1, 2003